

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25-29, and 32-34 are pending and under consideration.

### I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-5, claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25-29, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollon (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,164) in view of Yutaka et al. (JP 09026832) and Kasahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,151,696).

The Examiner acknowledges that the combination of Hollon nor Yutaka et al. does not disclose:

codes that are output as a result of an operation of each of the plurality of buttons correspond to instructions for each of the plurality of buttons and the instructions differ depending on the operation mode of the electronic apparatus,

as recited in claim 1. The Examiner attempts to make up for this deficiency with Kasahara et al. However, it is submitted that Kasahara et al. does not discuss or suggest:

codes that are output as a result of an operation of each of the plurality of buttons correspond to instructions for each of the plurality of buttons and the instructions differ depending on the operation mode of the electronic apparatus,

as recited in claim 1. Kasahara et al., as relied on by the Examiner, merely discloses a remote control apparatus that outputs a code in response to a manipulation of buttons or keys that are provided on the remote control. The remote control apparatus of Kasahara et al. is used to control an electronic apparatus, such as a television receiver. However, the remote control is not itself part of the electronic apparatus, but instead is a separate, independent apparatus. This is in contrast to claim 1, which provides for outputting codes as a result of an operation of buttons that are provided on the claimed electronic apparatus. Furthermore, the modes of the remote control apparatus (modes I, II, and III) are modes of the remote control apparatus itself and do not correspond to modes of the electronic apparatus that is controlled by the remote control apparatus.

Also, it would not have been obvious, as the Examiner contends, to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Hollon nor Yutaka et al. to output codes as taught by

Kasahara et al. because Kasahara et al. requires an additional apparatus (a remote control) in order to perform the function of outputting the codes. Thus, the principle of operation of the apparatus of Hollon nor Yutaka et al. would be changed.

Since Hollon, Yutaka et al., and Kasahara et al., alone or in combination, do not discuss or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and there is proper motivation for combining the references, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4, 10-13, 27, and 32-33 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 3, 4, 10-13, 24, and 27 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Hollon, Yutaka et al., and Kasahara et al., alone or in combination, do not discuss or suggest:

codes that are output as a result of an operation of each of the plurality of buttons correspond to instructions for each of the plurality of buttons and the instructions differ depending on the operation mode of the electronic apparatus,

as recited in claim 5. Therefore, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 15-18, 25, and 28 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 5 and include all the features of claim 5, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 6, 15-18, 25, and 28 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Hollon, Yutaka et al., and Kasahara et al., alone or in combination, do not discuss or suggest:

codes that are output as a result of an operation of each of the plurality of buttons correspond to instructions for each of the plurality of buttons and the instructions differ depending on the operation mode of the electronic apparatus,

as recited in claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 20-23, 26, 29, and 34 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7 and include all the features of claim 7, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 8, 20-23, 26, and 29 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-2-09

By:   
Aaron C. Walker  
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501